

Amdt. dated December 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

Serial No. 09/591,035
Docket No. STL920000063US1
Firm No. 0054.0047

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 21 have been amended. No new claims have been added. No claims have been canceled. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

The Applicants would like to thank Examiner Mirza for holding a telephone interview with their representative on Monday, December 6, 2004, at 1:00 p.m. (EST). During the telephone interview, claim 1 and the cited art was discussed. No agreement was reached.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al. (U.S. 2002/0073236, hereinafter "Helgeson"), and in view of O'Brien et al. (U.S. 6,351,776, hereinafter "O'Brien"). Assignee respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

By use of the present invention, a transaction-based application is adapted to process transactions over a network such as an internet or intranet. The transaction-based application is adapted by scanning the source code of the transaction-based application to identify the transaction and the related information, wherein the transaction-based application does not process transactions over the network (e.g., Specification, page 10, lines 23-26); storing in a database the related information identified in the scan of the source code, hereinafter identified information; extracting from the database parameter definitions describing a communication of information by the transaction, hereinafter extracted information; identifying a parameter usage type for each parameter, said parameter usage type selectable from the parameter usage type set comprising input, output, input/output, and unreferenced; displaying the transaction and a subset of the related information and extracted information; allowing a user to select the transaction; and, using the identified information and extracted information to package the user-selected transaction in a form compatible with a connector building tool, wherein the identified

Amdt. dated December 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

Serial No. 09/591,035
Docket No. STL920000063US1
Firm No. 0054.0047

information and extracted information enable building a connector to enable the transaction-based application to process transactions over the network (e.g., Specification, page 14, lines 13-14, FIG. 3, block 345).

Thus, the claimed invention is directed towards analyzing a transaction-based application in order to build a connector to adapt the transaction-based application to process transactions over a network such as an internet or intranet.

The Helgeson patent translates data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, and vice versa. (Abstract). The Helgeson patent does not teach or suggest processing the source code of a transaction-based application to output data in a form compatible with a connector building tool.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that the Helgeson patent at p. 2, col 0016 teaches a method of adapting a transaction-based application to process transactions over a network, said transaction-based application comprising source code describing a transaction and information related to the transaction, hereinafter related information, said method comprising the steps of scanning the source code of the transaction-based application to identify the transaction and the related information, wherein the transaction-based application does not process transactions over the network. However, at p. 2, col. 0016, the Helgeson patent teaches:

"The system may also include a monitor component for monitoring changes of a data object at a system, with the monitoring component having both a system independent service subcomponent and a system specific service component utilizing a native API of the monitored system to monitor changes of the data object. The system may also include a mapper component for identifying a local object identifier and a document type."

The Examiner submits that the term "monitoring" is broad enough to describe scanning. Applicants traverse. The cited portion of the Helgeson patent does not describe scanning application source code for a transaction or any type of scanning of application source code and makes no reference to a transaction-based application that does not process transactions over the network. The Helgeson patent at p. 2, col. 0016 teaches the monitoring of application data. The

Amdt. dated December 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

Serial No. 09/591,035
Docket No. STL920000063US1
Firm No. 0054.0047

monitoring of application data does not scan an application source code to identify a transaction. Thus, the Helgeson patent fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and even if one were to combine the teachings of the Helgeson patent and the O'Brien patent, the combination still fails to teach or suggest the present invention.

The Examiner also asserts that the Helgeson patent at p. 19, par. 0381-0382 teaches storing in a database the related information identified in the scan of the source code, hereinafter identified information. The cited portion of the Helgeson patent describes persistence of data, but there is no teaching or suggestion of storing related information identified in the scan of the source code. That is, because, as discussed above, the Helgeson patent fails to teach scanning application source code to identify a transaction and related information related to the transaction, the Helgeson patent also fails to teach storing the related information identified in the scan of the source code. Thus, the Helgeson patent fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and even if one were to combine the teachings of the Helgeson patent and the O'Brien patent, the combination still fails to teach or suggest the present invention.

The Examiner further asserts that the Helgeson patent at p. 12, col. 0277-0278 teaches extracting from the database parameter definitions describing communication of information by the transaction, hereinafter extracted information and identifying a parameter usage type for each parameter and that p. 19, col. 0387 teaches that said parameter usage type selectable from the parameter usage type set comprising input, output, input/output, and unreferenced. The cited portion of the Helgeson patent at p. 12, col. 0277-0278 describes stored procedures that take the marshaled arguments that come in, and store them in specific fields in the database, and vice versa. The cited portion of the Helgeson patent at page 19, col. 0387 describes that "transactional attributes are separately declared in the bean's deployment descriptor (for a specific method, or as the bean's default) as one of the following six options: TX_NOT_SUPPORTED, TX_SUPPORTS, TX_REQUIRED, TX_REQUIRES_NEW, TX_MANDATORY, TX_BEAN_MANAGED." The options for the transactional attributes indicate whether a

Amdt. dated December 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

Serial No. 09/591,035
Docket No. STL920000063US1
Firm No. 0054.0047

transaction is supported, required, mandatory, or managed, but the options do not indicate a parameter usage type of input, output, input/output, and unreferenced.

The Examiner also asserts that the Helgeson patent at p. 19, para. 0387 teaches displaying the transaction and a subset of the related and extracted information:

"For transactions, an application developer has two options: 1) to explicitly demarcate the boundaries of a transaction, or 2) to use declarative transactional management available with EJBs. Use of declarative transactional management is cleaner and is strongly recommended. In this case, the level of granularity for managing transactions corresponds to methods in a bean. Instead of interleaving transaction boundaries within business logic, transactional attributes are separately declared in the bean's deployment descriptor (for a specific method, or as the bean's default) as one of the following six options:

TX_NOT_SUPPORTED, TX_SUPPORTS, TX_REQUIRED, TX_REQUIRES_NEW,
TX_MANDATORY, TX_BEAN_MANAGED. Details of these can be found in books on EJB."

First, because the Helgeson patent fails to teach scanning application source code to identify a transaction and related information related to the transaction, then the Helgeson patent also fails to teach displaying a subset of the related information identified in the scan of the source code. Moreover, the cited portion of the Helgeson patent describes transaction options and does not describe displaying the transaction and a subset of the related and extracted information. In the Office Action (mailed on September 8, 2004), the Examiner also cites page 29, paragraph 0545 of the Helgeson patent, which describes placing data from a bean onto a page, but the mere display of data on a page does not teach or suggest displaying the transaction and a subset of the related and extracted information.

The Examiner submits that the Helgeson patent does not disclose allowing a user to select the transaction and using the identified information and extracted information to package the user-selected transaction in a form compatible with a connector building tool.

Amdt. dated December 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

Serial No. 09/591,035
Docket No. STL920000063US1
Firm No. 0054.0047

However, the Examiner asserts that the O'Brien patent at col. 15, ln. 21-27 teaches using the identified and extracted information to package the user-selected transaction in a form compatible with a connector building tool.

The O'Brien patent describes a user interface and a means by which users can establish, use, and maintain filed on the Internet in a manner remote from their local computers (Abstract). The O'Brien patent does not overcome the defects of the Helgeson patent. The cited portion of the O'Brien patent describes:

"If at step 714 the user must be sent back to the same database, query is made at step 740 to determine if that database is still up. If it is, the request is passed to the pool specification 720 where it is subsequently passed to the database object 236, on to the connection pool 730, and the appropriate database, either the transaction database 150 or the query database 152."

A "connection pool" is not a connector building tool, and the O'Brien patent teaches at col. 8, ln. 16-18 "The EJB cluster (EJBC) caches memory of common resources such as the pooling of data connections and the like, as well as data objects." Also, passing a request to a pool specification and subsequently to a database does not teach or suggest packaging a user-selected transaction in a form compatible with a connector building tool. Because the combination of the Helgeson patent and the O'Brien patent fails to teach scanning application source code to identify a transaction and related information related to the transaction, wherein the transaction-based application does not process transactions over the network, then the combination of the Helgeson patent and the O'Brien patent also fails to teach using the related information identified in the scan of the source code. Also, neither the Helgeson patent nor the O'Brien patent describe that the identified information and extracted information enable building a connector to enable the transaction-based application to process transactions over the network. Thus, the O'Brien patent fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and even if one were to combine the teachings of the Helgeson patent and the O'Brien patent, the combination still fails to teach or suggest the present invention.

Amdt. dated December 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

Serial No. 09/591,035
Docket No. STL920000063US1
Firm No. 0054.0047

In the Office Action, the Examiner also indicated the O'Brien patent at Col. 7, lines 55-59 and lines 64-67 discloses that "user to link a transaction-based application on the mainframe to the internet and/or worldwide web, where the transaction based application was not originally designed fro web or internet based transactions." The O'Brien patent provides means by which users can establish, use, and maintain files on the Internet in a manner remote from their local computers (Abstract). The O'Brien patent is not attempting to process the source code of a transaction-based application that does not process transactions over the network to output data in a form compatible with a connector building tool to enable the transaction-based application to process transactions over the network. Also, the cited portion of the O'Brien patent merely describes that web servers may handle HTTP requests. The O'Brien patent does not address enabling a transaction based application to work with the web or internet based transactions.

Assignee therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent claims 1, 9, and 17.

Relative to dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24, these dependent claims depend from independent claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively. Since these dependent claims depend from independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and Assignee believes it has successfully traversed the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24.

Amtd. dated December 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

Serial No. 09/591,035
Docket No. STL920000063US1
Firm No. 0054.0047

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-24 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: December 8, 2004

By: Janaki K. Davda

Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984